

# AN INVERSE PROBLEM FOR AN ABSTRACT EVOLUTION EQUATION

S. V. KOSHKIN, A. G. RAMM

ABSTRACT. The inverse problem of finding the coefficient  $\gamma$  in the equation  $\dot{u} = A(t)u + \gamma(t)u + f(t)$  from the extra data of the form  $\phi(t) = \langle u(t), w \rangle$  is studied. The problem is reduced to a Volterra equation of the second kind. Applications are given to parabolic equations with second order differential operators.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the Cauchy problem

$$\dot{u} = A(t)u + \gamma(t)u + f(t), \quad u(0) = u_0, \quad (1.1)$$

with the following extra data

$$\phi(t) = \langle u(t), w \rangle. \quad (1.2)$$

Here  $A(t)$  is a family of closed densely defined operators on a Banach space  $X$ , which generates an evolution family  $U(t, s)$  (see [1]),  $u_0 \in X$ ,  $w \in X^*$  and  $f$  is a given function on  $[0, T]$  with values in  $X$ . The problem (1.1) is understood in the mild sense, i.e as solving the integral equation

$$u(t) = V(t, 0)u_0 + \int_0^t V(t, s)f(s)ds, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $V(t, s)$  is the evolution family generated by  $A(t) + \gamma(t)$ . Here  $\gamma(t)$  is an unknown scalar function of time, which should be recovered from the knowledge of the extra data  $\phi(t)$ . In applications  $\gamma(t)$  may be a control function and  $\phi(t)$  is a measured quantity. That is we have an inverse problem of finding control which brings the desired measurements.

Problems of this type when  $A(t)$  is a second order differential operator with the Dirichlet boundary condition were studied in [2], [6]. In [2] a local existence result was obtained. In [6] the authors assume that  $w$  is a Dirac measure supported at some interior point of the domain and use a complicated procedure to reduce the problem to the Volterra equation similar to the one we derive in the general setting. Our approach is similar to the one in [5]. In [8] one can find a very general approach to many inverse problems, the approach based on property C, that is, on completeness of the set of products of solutions to homogeneous differential equations.

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35R30, 81U40; Secondary: 47A40.

*Key words and phrases.* inverse problem, evolution equation, Volterra equation, maximum principle.

Let us describe the idea of the solution. One checks that

$$V(t, s) = e^{\int_s^t \gamma(\tau) d\tau} U(t, s). \quad (1.4)$$

Denote

$$\xi(t) := e^{-\int_0^t \gamma(\tau) d\tau} \quad (1.5)$$

and observe that

$$e^{\int_s^t \gamma(\tau) d\tau} = \frac{\xi(s)}{\xi(t)}.$$

Substituting (1.4) and (1.5) into (1.3), one gets

$$u(t) = \frac{1}{\xi(t)} U(t, 0) u_0 + \int_0^t \frac{\xi(s)}{\xi(t)} U(t, s) f(s) ds. \quad (1.6)$$

Now apply both sides of this equation to  $w$  and multiply by  $\xi(t)$  to get

$$\phi(t)\xi(t) = \langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle + \int_0^t \langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle \xi(s) ds. \quad (1.7)$$

Note that in equation (1.7) all the functions are known except  $\xi(t)$ . Assuming that  $\phi(t)$  is separated from 0 on  $[0, T]$  and dividing both sides by this function, one gets a Volterra equation of the second kind for  $\xi(t)$ . Once  $\xi(t)$  is found,  $\gamma(t)$  can be found by the formula

$$\gamma = -\frac{\dot{\xi}}{\xi}. \quad (1.8)$$

Here one assumes that  $\xi(t)$  corresponds to some  $\gamma$ . Otherwise, (1.8) implies (1.5) only under the additional conditions  $\xi > 0$ ,  $\xi(0) = 1$ . This brings some additional restrictions on the coefficients of (1.7) to guarantee the existence of a solution to the inverse problem.

Section 2 contains precise formulations and proofs of our results and some of their applications.

## 2. SOLVABILITY OF THE INVERSE PROBLEM

The uniqueness result follows directly from (1.7) under very mild conditions. In what follows  $\Delta_T := \{(s, t) | 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}$ . By  $c$  we denote below various positive constants.

**Proposition 2.1.** *In (1.1)-(1.2) assume that*

1.  $\|U(t, s)\| \leq M$  on  $\Delta_T$ .
2.  $f \in L^\infty([0, T], X)$  and  $w \in X^*$ .
3.  $\phi(t)$  is measurable on  $[0, T]$  and  $\phi(t) \geq c > 0$ .

*Then there exists at most one solution  $\gamma \in L^2([0, T])$  to the inverse problem (1.1)-(1.2).*

*Proof.* If there are  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  such that (1.1)- (1.2) are satisfied then  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$  defined by (1.5) will satisfy Volterra equation. It follows from our assumptions that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle| &\leq M \|u_0\| \|w\| < \infty, \\ \sup_{(s, t) \in \Delta_T} |\langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle| &\leq M \|f\| \|w\| < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

so the kernels of the Volterra equation are bounded. They remain bounded after the division by  $\phi(t) \geq c > 0$  which turns (1.7) into a Volterra equation of the second kind. Since this equation has at most one solution in  $L^2([0, T])$  we conclude that  $\xi_1 = \xi_2$ . Then  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$  from (1.8).  $\square$

One can prove the uniqueness of the solution of the Volterra integral equation  $h(x) = \int_0^x v(x, y)h(y)dy + f$  in  $L^1([0, T])$  also in the case when the kernel  $v(x, y)$  is unbounded, for example, if  $\sup_{x \in [0, b]} \int_0^b |v(x, y)|dy < c$ . Existence results for the inverse problem are based on solving equation (1.7). But we need more from the solution than just being in  $L^2$ . The following lemma states conditions on the coefficients that guarantee these additional properties.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Consider the equation*

$$\phi(t)\xi(t) = \alpha(t) + \int_0^t \beta(t, s)\xi(s)ds, \quad (2.1)$$

where

1.  $\alpha, \phi \in W_2^1([0, T])$ ,  $\alpha(t)\phi(t) > 0$  on  $[0, T]$ ,
2.  $\beta \in L^\infty(\Delta_T)$ ,  $\beta := \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \in L^2(\Delta_T)$ .

Then there exists a unique solution  $\xi \in L^2([0, T])$  to (2.1) and also  $\xi(0) = \frac{\alpha(0)}{\phi(0)}$ ,  $\xi \in W_2^1([0, T])$ . Moreover, there exists  $0 < \tau \leq T$  such that  $\xi(t) > 0$  on  $[0, \tau]$ . If additionally

3.  $\beta \geq 0$  on  $\Delta_T$ ,  $\phi(t) > 0$  on  $[0, T]$

then  $\xi(t) > 0$  on  $[0, T]$ .

Proof of this lemma is standard (use iterations), and we omit it.

**Proposition 2.2.** *In (1.1)-(1.2) assume that*

1.  $\|U(t, s)\| \leq M$  on  $\Delta_T$ .
2.  $\phi \in W_2^1([0, T])$  and  $\phi(0) = \langle u_0, w \rangle \neq 0$ ,
3.  $\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle \in W_2^1([0, T])$ ,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle \in L^2(\Delta_T)$ .

Then there exist a  $\tau$ :  $0 < \tau \leq T$ , and a unique pair  $u \in C([0, \tau], X)$  and  $\gamma \in L^2([0, \tau])$  which satisfies (1.1)- (1.2).

*Proof.* Set  $\alpha(t) := \langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle$  and  $\beta(t, s) := \langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle$ . Since  $\alpha(0) = \langle U(0, 0)u_0, w \rangle = \langle u_0, w \rangle = \phi(0) \neq 0$  and both functions  $\alpha, \phi$  are continuous they have the same sign in some neighbourhood of 0. So the conditions of Lemma 2.1 are satisfied in this case. Let  $\xi$  be the solution of (2.1) then  $\xi \in W_2^1$ ,  $\xi > 0$  and  $\xi(0) = \frac{\alpha(0)}{\phi(0)} = 1$ . Therefore,  $\gamma$  defined by (1.8) lies in  $L^2([0, \tau])$  and satisfies (1.5). Define  $u(t)$  by (1.6) then (1.7) says that  $\phi(t) = \langle u(t), w \rangle$  and (1.2) is satisfied. Finally, (1.5) together with (1.6) are equivalent to (1.4) which means that (1.1) is satisfied also. Thus,  $\gamma$  and  $u$  solve the inverse problem on  $[0, \tau]$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let the conditions of Proposition 2.2 hold and in addition  $\phi(t) > 0$ ,  $\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle > 0$  on  $[0, T]$  and  $\langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle \geq 0$  on  $\Delta_T$ . Then there exists a unique pair  $u \in C([0, T], X)$  and  $\gamma \in L^2([0, T])$  which satisfies 1.1-1.2.*

*Proof.* The argument is essentially the same as above with one difference: by Lemma 2.1  $\xi$  is now positive on the whole interval  $[0, T]$  and not only in a small neighborhood of 0 so that  $\tau = T$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{D}_A$  be the domain of a closed densely defined linear operator  $A$  and for a family  $A(t)$  of such operators  $\mathcal{D} := \cap_{t>0} \mathcal{D}_{A(t)}$  with the corresponding norm  $\|x\|_{\mathcal{D}} := \|x\| + \sup_{t>0} \|x\|_{\mathcal{D}_{A(t)}}$ . Likewise,  $\mathcal{D}^* := \cap_{t>0} \mathcal{D}_{A^*(t)}$ . If  $w \in \mathcal{D}^*$ , then some smoothness conditions are satisfied. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle &= \langle u_0, \frac{d}{dt} U^*(t, 0)w \rangle = \langle u_0, U^*(t, 0)A^*(t)w \rangle \in L^\infty([0, T]) \\ \frac{d}{dt} \langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle &= \langle f(s), \frac{d}{dt} U^*(t, s)w \rangle = \langle f(s), U^*(t, s)A^*(t)w \rangle \in L^\infty([0, T]). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the problem of finding a coefficient of a parabolic equation. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary, define  $X := L^2(\Omega)$ . Then the family of uniformly elliptic operators  $A(t)$  may be defined by the differential expression

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (a_{ij}(x, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}) + b_i(x, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + a(x, t) \quad (2.2)$$

(summation over the repeated indices is understood,  $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ ) and the Dirichlet boundary conditions. Under certain restrictions on the coefficients it follows from the general theory of parabolic equations (see [4]) that the Cauchy problem

$$\dot{u} = A(t)u, \quad u(0) = u_0, \quad (2.3)$$

is uniquely solvable in  $C([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$ . Therefore, it defines an evolution family  $U(t, s)$  by setting  $U(t, s)u_0$  equal to the solution of

$$\dot{u} = A(t)u, \quad u(s) = u_0, \quad s \leq t$$

at the moment  $t$ . Using Proposition 2.2 we can easily establish the result proved for the one dimensional case,  $\Omega = [0, 1]$  in [2]. The closure in the norm of the Sobolev space  $W_2^1(\Omega)$  of the set of smooth and compactly supported in  $\Omega$  functions is denoted by  $W_2^1(\Omega)$ . By  $W_{2,0}^2(\Omega)$  we denote the intersection of  $W_2^2(\Omega)$  and  $W_2^1(\Omega)$ .

**Corollary 2.1.** *Consider the problem (1.1)-(1.2), where  $A(t)$  is defined by (2.2). Assume that*

1.  $\exists \mu, \nu > 0 : \nu \sum_i \xi_i^2 \leq a_{ij}(x, t) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \mu \sum_i \xi_i^2$ ,
2.  $a, b_i \in L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega))$ ,  $\frac{\partial a_{ij}}{\partial t} \in L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega))$ ,
3.  $u_0 \in W_2^1(\Omega)$ ,  $f \in L^\infty([0, T], W_2^1(\Omega))$ .
4.  $w \in L_2(\Omega)$ ,  $\phi \in W_2^1([0, T])$  and  $\phi(0) = \langle u_0, w \rangle \neq 0$ .

*Then there exist a  $\tau: 0 < \tau \leq T$ , and a unique pair  $u \in W_2^1([0, \tau], W_{2,0}^2(\Omega))$  and  $\gamma \in L^2([0, \tau])$  which satisfies (1.1)-(1.2).*

*Proof.* Recall that  $U(t, 0)u_0$  is a solution to the parabolic problem with the initial data  $u_0$ . Under the conditions 1.-4. of Corollary 2.1 it is known that  $U(t, 0)u_0 \in W_2^1([0, T], W_2^1(\Omega))$  ([4], p.178-180). Then for  $w \in L^2(\Omega)$  the function  $\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle$  is in  $W_2^1([0, T])$ . Similarly,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}U(t, s)f(s) \in L^\infty([s, T], W_{2,0}^2(\Omega))$  for a fixed  $s$  and, therefore,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle \in L^2(\Delta_T)$ . Thus, all of the conditions of Proposition 2.2 are fulfilled.  $\square$

An alternative reference to [4] may be [3], where Theorem 6.1 on p.150 shows that our operator  $A(t)$  generates an evolution family in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

For the global solvability it is important that  $U(t, s)$  be a positive evolution family in the sense that  $u_0 \geq 0$  implies  $U(t, s)u_0 \geq 0$  (pointwise) due to the maximum principle for the parabolic equations [4],[7]. The following result (Corollary 2.2) is similar to the one in [6]. The authors of [6], however, used different spaces and the data which correspond in our general scheme to the choice of  $w$  as a delta-function supported at an interior point of  $\Omega$ , see remark 2.2 below.

**Corollary 2.2.** *In addition to the assumptions 1.-4. of Corollary 2.1 assume that  $\phi, w > 0$  on  $[0, T]$ ;  $u_0, f \geq 0$ ,  $u_0 \neq 0$ . Then there exists a unique pair  $u \in C([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$  and  $\gamma \in L^2([0, T])$  which satisfies (1.1)-(1.2).*

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.3 it suffices to prove that

$$\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle > 0, \langle U(t, s)f(s), w \rangle \geq 0.$$

The latter follows from the usual maximum principle for parabolic equations ([4], p.188). For the same reason  $\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle \geq 0$ . Assume that  $\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle = 0$  for some  $t > 0$ . Since  $w > 0$  one obtains  $U(t, 0)u_0 = 0$  for some  $t > 0$ . Then, by the strong maximum principle ([7], p.174-175),  $u_0 = 0$  in contradiction with our assumption. Thus,  $\langle U(t, 0)u_0, w \rangle > 0$  on  $[0, T]$  as we claimed.  $\square$

*Remark 2.2.* Formally the case of measurements at one point, i.e.  $w = \delta_{x_0}$ ,  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , is not covered by this theorem since  $\delta_{x_0} \notin L_2(\Omega)$ . However, it may be easily included in the general scheme by choosing the data into such spaces that the solution to the parabolic problem belongs to  $W_2^1([0, T], X)$  with  $\delta_{x_0} \in X^*$ . A possible choice is the Hölder spaces used in [6].

The above constraints on  $A(t)$ ,  $u_0$ , and  $f$  can be weakened if additional constraints are imposed on  $w$  as explained in remark 2.1.

**Corollary 2.3.** *In the problem (1.1)-(1.2), where  $A(t)$  is defined by (2.2), assume that*

1.  $\exists \mu, \nu > 0 : \nu \sum_i \xi_i^2 \leq a_{ij}(x, t)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \mu \sum_i \xi_i^2$ ,
2.  $a, b_i \in L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega))$ ,
3.  $f \in L^\infty([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$ ,  $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ ,
4.  $w \in W_{2,0}^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\phi \in W_2^1([0, T])$  and  $\phi(0) = \langle u_0, w \rangle \neq 0$ ,
5.  $\phi, w > 0$  on  $[0, T]$ ;  $u_0, f \geq 0$ ,  $u_0 \neq 0$ .

*Then there exists a unique pair  $u \in L^\infty([0, T])$ ,  $\gamma \in L^2([0, T])$  which satisfies (1.1)-(1.2).*

*Proof.* It suffices to note that  $W_{2,0}^2(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{D}^*$  and use remark 2.1 to verify the necessary smoothness. The rest of argument is the same as in corollaries 2.1, 2.2.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Yu. L. Daletsky, S. V. Fomin, *Measures and differential equations in infinite-dimensional space*, Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), 76, Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht, 1991.
- [2] V.Kamynin, M.Saroldi, *On an inverse problem of recovering a coefficient in second order parabolic equation of non-divergent type*, Pubblicazioni dell'instituto di analisi globale e applicazioni, n.83, pp. 1-14.
- [3] A.Pazy, *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, Springer, New York, 1983.
- [4] O.Ladyzhenskaya, V.Solonnikov, N.Ural'ceva *Linear and quasi-linear equations of parabolic type*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1968.
- [5] A. Lorenzi, A.G. Ramm, *Some identification problems for integro-differential operator equations*, Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Applications, 6, N1, (2001)
- [6] A.Prilepko, V.Solov'ev, *On solvability of the inverse boundary value problem of finding a coefficient of a lower order derivative in a parabolic equation*, Diff.Eq.,23(1987), no.1, 136–143.
- [7] M.Protter, H.Weinberger, *Maximum principles in differential equations*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- [8] A.G.Ramm, *Property C for ODE and applications to inverse problems*, In the book "Operator Theory and its Applications", Amer. Math.Soc., Fields Institute Communications, Vol. 25, pp.15-75, Providence, RI, 2000. (editors A.G.Ramm, P.N. Shivakumar, A.V.Strauss)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY MANHATTAN, KANSAS, 66506-2602, USA

*E-mail address:* koshkin@math.ksu.edu; corresponding author: ramm@math.ksu.edu